

and
It looks as if Frank
Kelley has finally hit
on the right track.
I think that a
critical review of
the automation vs manual
or combination of is
over due. This is
an area from which
we can benefit greatly

It is my opinion
that the committee
should discuss the
point thoroughly
separately then hear
the Scharff study.
Following this presentation
with a closed session
I believe we can
bring RA around
to this position.

" 117 L FILE "

27 JUL 1959

Please review these
and comment.

July 22, 1959

Members of the WS-117L Committee:

Mr. Ralph Clark
Mr. Harry H. Goode
Dr. Jesse Greenstein
Dr. David A. Kahn
Mr. Amron Katz
Mr. Arthur C. Lundahl
Dr. C. B. Tompkins
Mr. F. M. Kelly
Maj H. F. Wenberg

Subject: Meeting of June 1 and 2, 1959 at Itok

Enclosure: Recommendations Being Considered by the Committee

Gentlemen:

Attached is a discussion by Mr. Frank Kelly of our tentative recommendations considered at the last meeting which I am transmitting to you for your information.

You will note that Mr. Kelly wants to add another problem for discussion at our next meeting, and I think it makes good sense to do so. May I please have any opinions on this matter that you may care to state? If I don't hear from you within the next three weeks, I will assume that we want to follow the suggestions made by Mr. Kelly in the attached letter.

Very truly yours,

Robert H. Shatz

Robert H. Shatz, Chairman
WS-117L Special Studies Committee

RS:kss

HEADQUARTERS
ROME AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER
 AIR RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
 UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Griffins Air Force Base

New York



REPLY TO
 ATTN OF: RCWI

SUBJECT: Committee Meeting Held at Itek Corp.

17 July 1959

TO: Mr. Robert Schatz
 United Aircraft
 Missile and Space Systems Division
 East Hartford, Connecticut

Dear Bob:

In reviewing the minutes of the Committee Meeting held at the Itek Corp. I would suggest that you consider the following points with regards to Inclosure No. 2 "Recommendations Being Considered By The Committee".

(1) The mapping mission has been cancelled by ARPA. In turn ARDC has cancelled all efforts under this program. It is my understanding that the contract let by the Wright Air Development Center to the Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp., which was for the airborne package for this system, is being terminated. In view of these actions a discussion on a new tracking network for a defunct mapping system seems inappropriate at this time.

(2) All weather data obtained including the possibility of using 1" and 2" cameras in the early aero-med packages will be of great value to this system. During a recent visit to the Climatic Center in Washington, D. C. the weather personnel pointed out that they have been collecting weather data from all known stations around the world including Russia and its satellite countries for some time. Although many of these stations report sporadically they have consistently recorded and consolidated all the weather data received even though the normal daily recordings were not available. They pointed out that even though the data has been collected and analyzed consistently over the past fifteen years there is no definite weather pattern for any particular time period. In other words there has not been a specific pattern of cloud cover which can be assumed will occur over a particular area at any recognizable interval of time. Our only approach is to continue to collect all the data available in the hope that some identifiable pattern may eventually emerge.

(3) Experiments on the effects of the radiation belt on airborne equipment have been conducted by Eastman Kodak and Lockheed under this program. Prior to recommending this study I would suggest that a member of the Lockheed team studying these effects present the committee with the results of the Lockheed efforts at the October meeting. I attended a meeting about a year and a half ago at which time Lockheed had just set up a group to study the radiation effects on the airborne equipment. Since that time some of the Lockheed reports have indicated these efforts have been continuing. I do not know of the existence of any report which deals directly with this particular problem.

(4) Concur.

(5) Concur.

(6) A study on how R-W was to process this data has been under way for the last two months. When the Ramo Wooldridge Corp. submitted their proposed plan for handling this data during FY-60 the project office at RADC upon recommendations from the Data Processing Branch informed R-W that the basis for suggesting a group of equipment to process this type of data was not adequate. Therefore R-W was directed to make a comprehensive study of what Lockheed and its subcontractors, Airborne Instrument Laboratories and Haller Raymond and Brown, were proposing. Following this basic data gathering action R-W was requested to review their approach and resubmit a plan for handling this type of data from the airborne equipment. This information should be available by October and therefore it is recommended that this Committee recommendation be withheld until after the next committee meeting in October at which time R-W should present its approach to processing this type of data from the airborne collection system.

(7) Concur.

(8) Concur.

Now I would like to discuss another problem in which I believe the committee could assist this program.

As you know this ground data processing system depends to a great extent on its ability to accept raw data, and to interpret and extract usable information which can assist the intelligence community to perform its assigned task. One of the key areas which will contribute to our overall ground data processing system is the photo store (Center Format). In considering this photo store it becomes evident that we could blindly join the trend to automate for the sake of automation. To forestall falling into this trap I would like to request that between now and our October meeting committee members give serious thought to the photo store including the utilization of a manual, semiautomatic or automatic system and the economic impact of these possible solutions to the ground data processing system. Consideration should be given to establishing a criteria for determining where the changeover point occurs relative to the use of a manual system versus an automatic system.

This Center has Mr. Sam Scharff as a part time consultant. He has been working with the 438L group of late and is familiar with their unit record store problem.

Our approach would be to have Mr. Sam Scharff review the problem and draw up a chart in which a curve would be plotted to show the economic crossover point between an automatic and a manual unit record store. We believe that a few committee members, possibly Harry Goode, C. B. Tompkins and yourself, who are primarily systems oriented, would be the logical choice for this problem. You may prefer to work independently at first and then have the combined group including Mr. Sam Scharff, meet prior to the October meeting or you may prefer to confer continually. I am sure Sam Scharff would be willing to proceed to work on this unit record store problem using either of the above approaches. We plan to have R-W make an ops analysis study of the problem and present a report to RADC and possibly the committee during October 1959.

This problem is current and I believe good objective thinking on the part of the committee is needed at this time as this is a problem whereby the committee opinions can be considered prior to making a decision which has not always been the case in the past.

Hoping to hear from you soon I remain.

Sincerely



FRANCIS M. KELLY